

Hermosa Creek Watershed Management Plan Scoping Summary

November 2016

Addressed in this document are the public comments received during a scoping period for the Hermosa Creek Watershed Management Plan which occurred from March 3, 2015 through October 1, 2016. Scoping input was received as a result of a press release resulting in articles in local papers, letters and e-mails to those who had previously expressed interest in the project, public meetings, and public field trips. The Forest Service (FS) also presented an Initial Draft Proposed Action for scoping comments during this timeframe.

The Forest Service typically separates scoping comments and issues into two groups: *Issues* and *Non-Issues*. *Issues* are defined as those directly or indirectly caused by implementing the proposed action. An issue is also one that results in the generation of an alternative, part of an alternative, or design criteria or mitigation measure which specifically addresses that issue. The purpose of identifying issues at this stage of the analysis is to define the scope of the analysis and ensure that important concerns or opportunities are not overlooked.

Classification of a comment as a *Non-Issue* does not mean it is not important, it only means that it does not meet the above definition and will not be addressed in this analysis. *Non-Issues* fall within several general categories, with specific examples regarding this project given:

1) Outside the scope of the proposed action.

- Lack of enforcement of existing laws, rules, and regulations are administrative issues. Tools already exist to address these problems. e.g. - grazing permit terms, travel management rules, littering, illegal drug use, maintenance of roads and trails.
- Potential future Wild and Scenic designations are made by Congress and cannot be assumed in the writing of this Plan.
- Comments regarding parts of the legislation not related to the Hermosa watershed are beyond the scope of this project.
- Questions regarding specific project proposals for items *other than* recreation and travel management regulation are not included in this proposed action. For example, specific timber management activities, or winter grooming for cross-country skiing and fat tire bikes could be analyzed at a later date as specific project proposals.

2) Already decided by law, regulation, policy, Forest Plan, or other higher level decision;

- The legislation creating the Special Management Area (SMA) defines what is allowed, not allowed, and mandated to occur within the SMA. This cannot be changed in the Management Plan.
- Grazing is allowed in Wilderness under the Wilderness Act 1964, Congressional Wilderness Grazing Guidance given in 1980, and under Forest Plan guidance. The SMA legislation requires continued grazing in the SMA. Grazing analysis and re-authorization for most of this landscape was completed in 2009. We do not plan to re-visit that decision, although minor adjustments might be considered.
- Management of the part of the SMA that is also Colorado Roadless areas will be managed in accordance with that regulation.
- SMA slivers on the west side of the wilderness can't be managed as part of the wilderness because Congress purposefully did not include them as wilderness so that the Colorado Trail would not be in wilderness. The FS cannot change the boundaries of wilderness.
- Lower Hermosa Campground has already been converted to a fee campground under existing authorities.
- Suggestions for Forest-Plan level guidance that are already included or covered by the existing Forest Plan will not be repeated in the Hermosa Management Plan, although amendment of the Forest Plan specific to the Hermosa Watershed is being considered.

Hermosa Creek Watershed Plan Scoping Summary

- FS and Wilderness policy already address the use of drones.
- NEPA processes, NFMA requirements, and Executive Orders are already defined in Forest Service policy and guidance and will be followed.
- Suggestions for what should be included in the EA analysis (e.g. -NEPA analysis of motorized trails, recording of historical sites, etc.) are standard procedures and will be included.
- Complying with requirements of the Travel Management Rule, such as minimization of impacts and reduction of conflict, are standard procedures and will be included.

3) Irrelevant to the decision to be made;

- Requests for information or clarification, or to be added to the mailing list, etc.
- Outfitter/guide or other permitted uses are regulated under their own permitting processes, and will not be changed by the decision resulting from *this* analysis.
- Comments regarding areas outside the Hermosa Creek watershed, for example: comments regarding a snowmobile parking area at the base of Purgatory, the Sharkstooth area, or Molas Pass. Some roads and trails integral to, and only accessed through the watershed network may be included.

4) Purely opinion, conjectural, and not supported by rationale, scientific or factual evidence.

- Expressed support for an alternative or part of an alternative, with no supporting rationale that do not result in the need to create an alternative. The decision resulting from a NEPA analysis is not based on a popular vote.
- Statements of opinion such as, “More quiet use is better.”

5) Purely supportive of, included in, or addressed by, the Proposed Action.

- Statements that make suggestions for what is already included in the Proposed Action.
- The decision to include a Wilderness Plan and a TM Plan in the same plan as the SMA Plan was made.

The scoping period generated written responses from approximately 126 sources, which includes about 40 form submissions. There were recurring Issues mentioned throughout many of the comments. These issues were grouped together by theme, and are listed in Table 1 below. A listing of all the commenters then follows in Table 2, showing which Issues and/or Non-Issue(s) each commenter mentioned. Full text of the comments can be found in the project record, and are available upon request.

An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared. The Issues will be responded to and analyzed in either an alternative or design criteria/mitigation measures in the EA. A 30-day public comment period will be held for public review of the pre-decisional EA.

The following Issues were identified by the Forest Service:

Table 1. Issues

<u>Issue Theme</u>	<u>Specific Issues</u> Bold + Highlight= related to Plan level direction; regular text = related to project level direction	<u>Where Addressed</u>
1. Summer Recreational Uses		
1A. Motorized/ Non-Motorized Use	Corral Draw motorized trail is in an unsuitable area per current Forest Plan Reduce trail and road density.	Alts 2-4 redraw suitable over-ground travel areas 3.28.64 guidance will show different net trail ratios for each alt.
	Motorized use ruins quiet use; hunters seek a non-motorized area	motorized use is legislated, Alt4

Hermosa Creek Watershed Plan Scoping Summary

<u>Issue Theme</u>	<u>Specific Issues</u> Bold + Highlight= related to Plan level direction; regular text = related to project level direction	<u>WhereAddressed</u>
1A.cont'd - Motorized	Don't expand motorized uses, 41+ miles is excessive.	Alt 4
	Congestion along main stem between Salt Creek and bottom – add a “hikers only” trail and fisherman access	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Keep motors off the Hermosa Creek Trail. Allow on specific days of the week?	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Limit motorized use as much as possible to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	Alt 4
	Add motorized trail to replace loss of Clear Creek	Alts 2 & 3
	There is a connection with on-going Rico/W Dolores TM planning	Alt 1-4 align with adjacent planning options for Tin Can Basin road
	Implement noise restrictions; motorized use is noise and air pollution	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	West Cross should be non-motorized/non-mechanized because of historic significance.	Alt 2 - non-motorized, but bikes allowed. Alt 4 - foot and horse only
	Opposition to motorized use on the Upper Dutch Creek Trail or Little Elk or Big Lick– noise, expansion of illegal use, safety, overcrowding at the Strawberry Patch	Alts 1 & 4
	Motorized trail designation should be based on a trail-by-trail analysis regarding the minimization standard detailed in the TM Rule, not on “trades” or “swaps”.	Travel Analysis Process (TAP) will be updated
	Support for adding motorized trail on east side - Upper Dutch; Re-open trails on the east side to motorized	Alts 2 & 3
	Don't reward current illegal motorized use by designating the upper Dutch as motorized.	Alts 1 & 4
	Make Elbert and Little Elk motorized to enhance loop opportunities and reduce conflicts of traveling through the ski area.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Limit group size of motorized users	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	I would allow motorized use only on the main stem trail, Jones Creek Trail, and down to Mitchell Lakes	Alt 2
	Recommend some old logging roads in the north end for motorized use providing higher challenge levels.	Alt 3
	Side-by-side OHV (>50”) opportunities should be provided	Alt 3
	Motorized single track routes are limited in this state and therefore highly valued.	Alt 2 & 3
	Recommends opening old logging roads in the north end of the SMA to wider side-by-sides.	Alt 3
	The final Plan should enact road closures and decommissioning, and minimum road systems recommended in the TAP.	TAP will be updated; Minimum Road System will vary by Alt.
	The document lacks key provisions of the TM Rule, including analysis of every road and trail included in the planning area, for designation of minimum road system.	TAP will be updated
	We are encouraged that the Columbine District appears to be holding to the 50” width for ATV's	Alts 1, 2, & 4

Hermosa Creek Watershed Plan Scoping Summary

<u>Issue Theme</u>	<u>Specific Issues</u> Bold + Highlight= related to Plan level direction; regular text = related to project level direction	<u>WhereAddressed</u>
1A.cont'd - Motorized	Recommend seasonal closures for motorized use from Oct 1-June 15 and should be the same across the watershed for ease of understanding.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Recommend a Sept 1- June 15 seasonal closure	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Restrict motorized trail use after October 31.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Motorized seasonal closures should be Oct 1- June 30	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Motorized use that begins in dry conditions at the lower trailhead will reach mud and snow at higher elevations within an hour.	Alt 2 open dates for low elevation trails were reduced from original proposal
	Seasonal closures should apply equally to all users, not just motorized use, or remove seasonal restrictions on motorized.	Alts 2 & 4 restrict bikes also during seasonal closures. Alts Dismissed for seasonal restrictions on foot and horse - rationale in the EA.
1B. Mechanized Use	Don't allow mechanized trail use year-round because of winter stress on animals.	Alts 2 & 4 restrict bikes during seasonal closures.
	Keep single track moderate to easy trails for young riders	Alt 3
	Add east-west connection for bikes between CT and Hermosa Trail to replace loss of those in wilderness	Alts Dismissed for Buck Creek option - rationale for dismissal in the EA. Alts 2 & 3 include W Cross Trail.
	Restrict mechanized use on the east side (Upper Dutch, Little Elk, Big Lick) from Sept1-Nov 30 to reduce conflicts with hunters	Alts 2 & 4 include bikes in seasonal restriction, but not these dates.
	Designate many historically used currently non-system trails for use by bikes, including Relay Creek, Graysill, BRNRT, Seth's, and Lower Hermosa to Tripp. Implement a "limit to existing" interim policy until a good inventory can be accomplished.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA. Alts 2 & 3 includes "BRNRT"
	Consider an alternative that would classify key cross-country travel as designated routes for bikes.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Severe curtailment of biking will negatively impact future public sentiment for conservation and wilderness, and reduces income to the local economy	Alts 2 & 3
	Oppose banning bikes on Big Lick Trail	Alts Dismissed - removed from all Alts - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Support Elbert/Big Lick as non-mechanized	Alts Dismissed - removed from all Alts - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Make a parking lot on lower Hermosa road at pavement end for bike unloading	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Other modes of transportation affect the land as much or more than bikes	EA effects analyses
	Consider an E-bike route, as this use is certain to grow as a means of recreation	Alts 2 & 3 for Purgatory trails only

Hermosa Creek Watershed Plan Scoping Summary

<u>Issue Theme</u>	<u>Specific Issues</u> Bold + Highlight= related to Plan level direction; regular text = related to project level direction	<u>WhereAddressed</u>
	There are thousands of miles of local trails in wilderness for hikers and horseback riders to use that are closed to bikers, who are continually losing access.	Alts 2 &3
1C. General/Misc. Summer Use	Address conflicts and congestion between user-types on the Hermosa Trail	3.28.60 guidance added
	Add Objective in Access and TM section regarding need for increase in outreach, education, and signage where trail designations have changed.	3.28.60 guidance added
	Analysis should include cost assessment	All Alts
	Close trails with degraded conditions	All Alts include removal of wilderness trails with poor conditions
	Seasonal mechanized and motorized closures needed to protect trails from damage in wet conditions.	Alts 2-4
	Add West Cross trail to system	Alts 2-4
	Plan for horse trailer parking that won't be overrun by other recreationists.	Alts2 & 3
	Need more parking designed for trailers to reduce resource impacts and provide for safety.	Alts 2 & 3
	Developed campground should be large enough to accommodate larger RVs.	Alts 2 & 3
	Every trail should have a NEPA analysis and not be "grandfathered in" to the system if no prior NEPA has been done for them.	TAP will be updated
	The formerly private parcel should be managed to maintain its historic character and should not be considered for future development or dispersed camping areas	Alts 1& 4
2. Winter Recreational Uses	Winter permitted outfitters and groomed routes are in an unsuitable area according to the Forest Plan – need to amend the suitability determination.	Alts 2-4
	Winter suitability maps do not reflect current science, such as new lynx guidance.	Alts 2 & 3
	Winter suitability maps do not reflect capabilities of modern equipment.	Alts 2 & 3
	Winter suitability should not be based on hard dates, altitude, compacted snow depth, steep train, tree cover, lack of trailer parking, or segregating uses,	Alts 2 & 3
	Snow depth should be the major standard for winter motorized suitability, forthe protection of the resources underneath.	Alts 2-4
	Wheeled vehicles should not be allowed in over-snow suitability areas because of the higher pressure and damage to the snow buffer, including fat tire bikes.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Like quiet places to x-c ski	All Alts restrict winter motorized use.
	Continue usage of groomed routes and open riding in the northern end of the SMA.	Alts 2 & 3

Hermosa Creek Watershed Plan Scoping Summary

<u>Issue Theme</u>	<u>Specific Issues</u> Bold + Highlight= related to Plan level direction; regular text = related to project level direction	<u>WhereAddressed</u>
2. cont'd - Winter	Large open winter use areas are desired, not just designated trail systems. This also spreads out the impact.	Alts 2 & 3
	Economic contributions from winter motorized use must not be overlooked.	EA Recreation analysis section
	Mix of logging roads and parks and terrain provide all skill levels and diversity. Because of location, there is little conflict with non-motorized users – don't close any opportunities.	Alts 2 & 3
3. Vegetation Management/ Forest Health	Don't remove any suitable timber base	Alts Dismisses
	Need to create age class diversity and regenerate spruce-fir for forest health	Alts 2& 3havedesired conditions by structural class
	Maintain natural processes of biodiversity	3.28.5guidance
	Manage for future old growth through active cycles of harvest, utilization, and regeneration	Forest Plan required old growth management
	Highest priority for any uses should be the health of the overall ecosystem for long term sustainability	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Emphasize natural fire	3.28.48 & 3.28.49 guidance
	No need for a vegetation type desired condition by percentage -it is too rigid and should be removed. Objective 3.28.6 is an "overreach".	Alt 4
	Objectives for Timber do not logically follow the legislative requirements. 3.28.39&40 should be removed.	Alt 4
	Direction for the SMA should emphasize ecological processes, not commodity production...the entire SMA should be designated and "unsuitable" with some wiggle room for ecological restoration.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Request for information on the helicopter landing zones to be maintained, referenced in 3.28.48	Alts 2 & 3
	Not clear how timber harvest or salvage can be used for ecological restoration or for the purposes of the legislation, or under the Roadless Rule. Please remove 3.28.9, 3.28.10 & 3.28.41	Alt 4
	Install some large livestock exclosures to evaluate vegetation management.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA. EA Monitoring Section.
	Please propose to replant native grasses and forbs, not just treat invasives.	Forest Plan addressed this. 3.28.13guidance
	Salvage logging is very destructive and introduces noxious weeds.	Alt 4
	I do not expect the forest to be managed to reduce forest fire, which I accept as natural	3.28.48 & 3.28.49 guidance
	Don't remove any [ML1] roads from system - they are needed for forest management.	Alt 1

Hermosa Creek Watershed Plan Scoping Summary

<u>Issue Theme</u>	<u>Specific Issues</u> Bold + Highlight= related to Plan level direction; regular text = related to project level direction	<u>WhereAddressed</u>
4. Water Quality/ Cutthroat Reintroduction Program	Provide for future motorized equip access for fish program	3.28.23 guidance, CO Roadless Rule allows
	Grazing in Hermosa Park damages the streambanks and water quality; Monitor riparian areas and use temp fence to protect streambanks from grazing. Fencing should not be limited to restoration areas 3.28.33	EA Monitoring section, Alts 2 & 4 – reworded 3.28.35guidance
	Mgt Plan should protect Outstanding Waters designation	Forest Plan addressed this.
	Secure current CRCT populations from non-natives and disease	3.28.24 guidance
	Continue restoration of CRCT populations to form a single metapopulation	Forest Plan addressed this. 3.28.24 guidance
	Signage should include info on CRCT conservation efforts, objectives, and reasoning, not just about whirling disease. 3.28.28	3.28.30 guidance reworded
	Aquatic invasive species should be considered along with terrestrial invasive weeds. 3.28.35	Forest Plan addresses this. 3.28.30 guidance reworded. Alts Dismissed for treatment - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Consider aquatic insect inoculation where Rotenone has been employed	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Should restore more than just 5 wetland acres within ten years. 3.28.20	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Eliminate the road creek crossing at the Upper trailhead	Alt 4
	Keep developed camping 50’ from the creek.	Alts 2 &4
	Dispersed camping can impact stream habitat	EA effects analyses
	Build a trail bridge at the Upper Trailhead and at the ford on FR 578	Alts 2 & 3
	Close dispersed sites immediately adjacent to the creek between the trailhead and the ford on 578	Alts 2 & 4
	Recommend closing 521, 518,516, and 514 to motorized use for watershed protection.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
5. Dispersed Camping	Transients are creating unsafe conditions in Lower Hermosa – don’t allow them camp here except in CG	Alts 2-4
	Dispersed camping too close to the streams creates water quality issues	Alts 2 & 4
	Dispersed camping is causing meadow and streambank damage	Alts 2 & 4
	Don’t phase out all disp. camping along the south side of Hermosa Park Rd.	Not proposed in any Alt
	The “300’ rule” should be ditched in the entire Hermosa watershed and a “2-vehicle length from the road” rule should be adopted, or something similar.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Only eliminate the 300’ rule if it can be enforced.	Alt 1
	One vehicle length for dispersed camping is too limiting, should be something like 50-100 feet.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Preserve Sig CG because it offers a place away from RVs.	All Alts preserve either a campground or dispersed camping at Sig

Hermosa Creek Watershed Plan Scoping Summary

<u>Issue Theme</u>	<u>Specific Issues</u> Bold + Highlight= related to Plan level direction; regular text = related to project level direction	<u>WhereAddressed</u>
6. Wildlife	Seasonal closures needed for wildlife breeding and recovery from winter and hunting season	3.28.62 guidance
	Use wildlife-friendly fencing, such as lay down fences in migration corridors	3.28.26 guidance
	Wildlife habitat and watershed should be given paramount priority over all other activities.	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Designate peregrine nesting areas Mar 25-July 31 with ½ mile buffer	EA wildlife section, Decision rationale
	Make seasonal closure dates Dec1- April 30 in the whole watershed for wintering big game and apply it to mechanized <i>and</i> motorized	Alts 2 & 4 include bikes in seasonal restriction, but not these dates.
	Recommends a closure to <i>all</i> entry in lower east Hermosa Dec 1-May 15 for big game calving	Alts Dismissed - rationale for dismissal in the EA.
	Keep the east side non-motorized to protect wildlife	Alt 4
7. Misc. Other	The ¼ mile strip of recommended wilderness between the designated wilderness and the creek should remain as recommended	Alt 4

Hermosa Creek Watershed Plan Scoping Summary

Table 2. Summary of Individual Scoping Comments

Comment #	Commenter (alphabetical)	Affiliation	Dated or Received	Issue # 1. Summer Recr. 2. Winter Recr. 3. Veg.Mgt. 4. Water/Fish 5. Disp. Camp. 6. Wildlife 7. Misc. Other	Non- Issue # 1. Outside scope of project 2. Already decided 3. Irrelevant to decision 4. Opinion or conjectural 5. Supportive or included in Proposal
1.	40+ misc	SJCA form letters	Sept 2016	1, 3, 4, 6	2
2.	Adams, Matt	Public Access Preservation Alliance	Sept. 21, 2016	1, 2	3, 5
3.	Addison, Clinton		July 8, 2016	1	
4.	Altman, Ian		Sept 22, 2016	1	
5.	Amos, Tom		Sept 19, 2016	1, 2	
6.	Baker, Bill		Mar 9, 2015	1, 3, 4	1, 2
7.	Baker, William		Sept 28, 2016	1, 3, 4	1, 2, 5
8.	Barnard, Stephen	DMC	Sept 22, 2016	1	
9.	Belles, Mark		June 5, 2015	1	2
10.	Berg, Art & Pat		Mar 20, 2015	1	1, 2, 5
11.	Birtcher, Normand	Montrose Forest Products	May 19, 2015 May 20, 2015	3	
12.	Blake, Westendorff, Lachelt	La Plata County Commissioners	Sept. 27, 2016		5
13.	Brown, S Beck		July 25, 2015	4	2
14.	Buickerood, Jimbo	SJCA	Sept 20, 2016	1, 3	2, 5
15.	Choquette, Kevin		Sept 29, 2016	1	
16.	Churchwell, Ty	Trout Unlimited	April 29, 2015 Sept 30, 2016	1, 4	1, 2, 5
17.	Cross, Ben		March 12, 2015 Sept 19, 2016	2	
18.	Deller, Jodi		Oct 3, 2016	1	
19.	Derck, Gary	Purgatory Ski Area	Sept. 30, 2016	1	2, 5
20.	Ellison, Carl		July 25, 2015	5	
21.	Ernst, Joey		Sept 22, 2016	1	
22.	Fecht, Dudley		Sept 17, 2016	1	
23.	Fish, Steven	DMC	Sept 14, 2016	1	
24.	Gaubert, Asam		Sept 22, 2016	1	
25.	Grub, Enid		Sept 12, 2016	1	3
26.	Gulliford, Andrew	Ft. Lewis College	March 4, 2015 March 29, 2015 July 6, 2015	1	1, 2, 5
27.	Hammond, Tony		Oct 3, 2016		3
28.	Harries, Rob		Oct 1, 2016	1	
29.	Harrison, James	DMC	Sept 19, 2016	1	
30.	Hartley, John		Oct 1, 2016	1	
31.	Hawkins, Mike		Sept 17, 2016	1	
32.	Hillers, Ellen		June 12, 2015	5	1
33.	Holland, Yvonne		June 8, 2015 Aug 2, 2016	5	1
34.	Holt, Steve	T Bar M Outfitters	Aug. 3, 2015		3
35.	Howell, Adam		Aug 21, 2016	1	1
36.	James, Jesse & Jessie		Apr 1, 2016	2	
37.	John, Linda		Sept 6, 2016	1	1

Hermosa Creek Watershed Plan Scoping Summary

Comment #	Commenter (alphabetical)	Affiliation	Dated or Received	Issue # 1. Summer Recr. 2. Winter Recr. 3. Veg.Mgt. 4. Water/Fish 5. Disp. Camp. 6. Wildlife 7. Misc. Other	Non- Issue # 1. Outside scope of project 2. Already decided 3. Irrelevant to decision 4. Opinion or conjectural 5. Supportive or included in Proposal
38.	Jones, Scott	CSA	May 20, 2015 Sept 28, 2016	2	1, 2
39.	Jones, Scott	COHVOC, , TPA,	Sept 28, 2016	1,	2, 5
40.	Kral, Tim		Oct 1, 2016	1	
41.	Krystyniak, Bernie		Sept 18, 2016	1	
42.	Kuprevich, Ben		Aug 25, 2016	1	1
43.	Kuwanwisiwma, Leigh	Hopi Tribe	Aug. 31, 2015		1, 2
44.	Laughlin, Lisa		Aug 3, 2016	5	1
45.	Mallett, Jerry		Sept 28, 2016	1, 4, 6	
46.	Mangus, Rollo & Patsy	Mangus 5 outfitter	Sept. 4, 2015	1	1
47.	Marion, Bob	Backcountry Hunters and Anglers	Jun 7, 2015 Sept 30, 2016	1	2
48.	Markward, Anne		Sept 26, 2016	1	
49.	Marusak, Paul		Sept 19, 2016	1	1
50.	McWilliams, Patrick	RP3 Mining Inc.	Feb. 23, 2015 May 18, 2015 Oct 14, 2015 Dec 28, 2015		1, 2, 3, 5
51.	Miller, Monte	DMC	Spet 16, 2016	1	
52.	Mitchell, David		Oct 5, 2015	1	
53.	Mitchell, David		10/5/15	1	
54.	Monroe-Brown, Mary + 26 members' comments	Trails 2000	April 20, 2015 Oct. 16, 2015 Nov. 2, 2015 Sept 30, 2016 Oct 7, 2016	1, 2	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
55.	Nelson, Marla	WildEarth Guardians	Nov. 17, 2015		3
56.	Nielsen, Jens		Sept 13, 2016	1	
57.	Noonan, Dan		Sept 29, 2016	1	
58.	Patton, John		Sept 12, 2016	1	
59.	Paulson, Deb		Mar 9, 2015	1, 4	1, 2
60.	Pearson, Mark		Sept 15, 2016	1, 5	1, 3, 5
61.	Peters, David		June 6, 2015	1	3
62.	Porter-Norton, Marsha		Feb. 27, 2015 July 9, 2015		2, 4
63.	Potts, Adam		July 1, 2016		
64.	Powers, Danny		Sept 21, 2016	1	
65.	Ritchey, Mark		Sept 30, 2016		
66.	Roberts, Cathy	4C BCHA	Sept 21, 2016	1, 4	
67.	Roessler, Marie		May 22, 2015 June 29, 2015	1	2
68.	Scheftel, Janice	SJ Basin Arch. Soc.	July 27, 2015	1	2
69.	Schertz, Peter		Sept 29, 2016	1, 5	5
70.	Seiler, Mark		Sept 17, 2016	1, 2	
71.	Siepeila, James	DMC	Sept 26, 2016	1	
72.	Skillen, Buck		July 21, 2015	1, 4	2
73.	Suesse, Ned		Sept 19, 2016	1, 2	

Hermosa Creek Watershed Plan Scoping Summary

Comment #	Commenter (alphabetical)	Affiliation	Dated or Received	Issue # 1. Summer Recr. 2. Winter Recr. 3. Veg.Mgt. 4. Water/Fish 5. Disp. Camp. 6. Wildlife 7. Misc. Other	Non- Issue # 1. Outside scope of project 2. Already decided 3. Irrelevant to decision 4. Opinion or conjectural 5. Supportive or included in Proposal
74.	Taylor, Lance & Terri	Taylor Guide & Outfitters	Aug. 24, 2015	1	
75.	Thorpe, Matt	CPW	Sept. 20, 2016	1, 4, 5, 6	2, 5
76.	Trembley, Ethan		Sept 6, 2016	1	1
77.	Turner, Pete & Lisa		Oct. 20, 2015 Sept 28, 2016	1, 5	
78.	VanMatre, Brady		Sept 19, 2016	1	
79.	VanWagenen, Rick		Aug., 17, 2015	3	
80.	VanZee, Kenneth		July 25, 2016	1	
81.	Wanner, Chuck		June 21, 2015	4	
82.	Way, Stuart		July 26, 2015	1	
83.	White, Jim	CPW	May 16, 2016	4	
84.	Widen, Jeff	Wilderness Soc.	Oct. 19, 2015 Sept 30, 2016	1, 7	1, 2, 5
85.	Wilkinson, Gary	SJ Trail Riders	April 16, 2015 Aug. 20, 2015 Sept 27, 2016	1	5
86.	Young, Sandy		Feb 15, 2015 June 26, 2016 Aug 13, 2016 Sept 30, 2016	1, 5, 6	1
87.	Zink, Ed				3